

Date: Wed, 2 Mar 94 21:09:13 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #228
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Wed, 2 Mar 94 Volume 94 : Issue 228

Today's Topics:

ACE Communications - good? bad?
Calling Deleware Hams
EI 7 EQB de EI 4 DJB
FT-530 vs TH-78A
Further criminalization of scanning
Have a say about ARRL policy
ICOM 2SRA mod filename?
IRS 501(c) tax-exempt status for our club - How?
JARGON
Low power Bird slugs
Medium range point-to-point digital links
Mobile Phone
QST review of Dual-Bander HTs
Satellite progs on World
SUBSCRIBE

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 1 Mar 1994 19:28:13 CST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!
news.eecs.uic.edu!uicvm.uic.edu!u29255@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ACE Communications - good? bad?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Too bad... I dealt with them about ten years ago, and they were tripping over
themselves to give me excellent service. They spent a lot of time describing

products to me, and then when I ordered the radio, decided I had enough fun (in a couple of weeks) and sent it back, they gave me my money back pronto. I liked them.

Date: 2 Mar 1994 06:13:43 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!udel!news.sprintlink.net!connected.com!krel.iea.com!comtch!pfeuffer@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Calling Deleware Hams
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Date: 2 Mar 1994 06:05:16 -0600
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: EI 7 EQB de EI 4 DJB
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

To all ,
 Sorry to take up the bandwidth

Fergal,
 I was in QS0 with you circa 2030 on s21 28/2/94 ,pls respond directly
 rah10@ail.amdahl.com

 tnx
 73's de Rory EI4DJB

Date: Tue, 1 Mar 94 16:45:45 GMT
From: dtint!allenw1.dtint.com!allen@uunet.uu.net
Subject: FT-530 vs TH-78A
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Feb27.210832.5738@yvax.byu.edu> , sandersm@yvax.byu.edu writes:

>I am debating on wether to buy a Yaesu FT-530 or a Kenwood Th-78A. I would like
>to hear experiences from owners of both radios. I am new to this hobby and
>would appreciate any info. 73's TNX Chad

I am also looking at both radios! Please post answers to the internet!
--

Tom Kimpton(System Administrator) {root,tom}@dtint.dtint.com
Digital Technology Int. (801)226-2984
500 W. 1200 South, Orem UT, 84057 FAX (801) 226-8438

Date: 2 Mar 94 03:00:02 CST
From: amiserv!bbs!kmeyer@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Further criminalization of scanning
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

grady@netcom.com (Grady Ward) writes:

>The FBI just announced their new wiretap bill for 1994.
>
>Among its many provisions, monitoring cordless phone
>will be criminalized, just like cellular is now.
>
>Presumably the FCC will have to act to ban all scanners
>that can tune the 46.xx range... I might suggest you buy those

It seems to me the FBI and FCC are trying to drive scanner manufacturers out of business by continually forcing them to redesign the circuitry. These laws aren't enforceable anyway unless you use the info in such a way that it can be proven you listened, which in itself is illegal.

Date: Wed, 02 Mar 94 02:10:55 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!mystis!
dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Have a say about ARRL policy
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare (KA1CV)) writes:

> You can contact most ARRL HQ staffers by email. I will post a
> list in my next post.
>
> I also suggest that all hams with an opinion or suggestion about a
> policy matter make their views known to their Division Director.
> The Division Directors are listed on page 8 of any recent QST.
> You can also usually find your Division Director at most major hamfests
> or ARRL Conventions.

Ours has even been at the last 3 membership meetings of our club (must have been that we have had some GREAT presentations lately). Can't beat

that for convenience, Ed.

(Please do not consider this an endorsement of the ARRL.) :)

Dan N8PKV

--

"We are all now safe from crime. The Brady 'Law' has taken effect.
All can sleep peacefully knowing our paternalistic government will
take care and protect us! Of course I also believe in Santa Claus,
The Easter Bunny, The Tooth Fairy and The Great Pumpkin!"

Date: 2 Mar 1994 01:05:34 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
news.intercon.com!panix!ddsw1!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!ornews.intel.com!
landeskb!bmiller@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ICOM 2SRA mod filename?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <h1b.762191716@loral> h1b@li.loral.com (h1b) writes:

>
>Does anyone know the filename for the ICOM 2SRA mod on ftp.std.com?
>AS I do not have direct ftp access I can only go thru a mail server.
>However, trying to get a list (ls) of the ICOM directory yielded an
>out of memory error. Looks like I need the exact filename.

>
>Thanks,
>h1b@li.loral.com

>
>--
>h1b@li.loral.com

>
3 files:

ic2sra
ic2sra.1
ic2sra.mod

--

Brett Miller N70LQ E-mail: brett_miller@ccm.hf.intel.com
Intel Corp.
American Fork, UT

Date: Wed, 2 Mar 94 01:12:33 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!nigel.msen.com!yale.edu!
noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: IRS 501(c) tax-exempt status for our club - How?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hello - I was wondering if anyone was a member of a club that has Federal
501(c) tax-exempt status? We would like to know how to do so ourselves.

We are Humboldt Amateur Radio Club, Inc., and are a state non-profit
organization. We have three chapters, each independantly governed
and maintaining their own identity. We have been working with a local
attorney who took our three page Constitution and By-Laws and turned it
into twelve pages of legalese and left out many important parts, such as
the identification of our chapters.

There has to be a relatively pain-free way to do this. Does anyone
have any advice on how to proceed from here?

Thanks in Advance,
Scott W. Binder AB6TR
Secretary, H.A.R.C.

```
-----
Scott W. Binder, AB6TR      /  /  /  /      Internet: swbinder@delphi.com
1000 7th #8                 /-/-/---/-/-/      FidoNet: 9@1:125/37
Arcata, CA 95521-6172      /  / ||/  /      GEnie: S.BINDER1
(707)826-7473              ||                Delphi: SWBINDER
PGP Public Key on Request  ||                Packet: AB6TR@K7WWA.#NORCAL.CA.USA
-----
```

Date: Wed, 2 Mar 1994 07:01:07 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!wa4mei.ping.com!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: JARGON
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <ah301-010394145634@sy_j.pgh.wec.com> ah301@yfn.ysu.edu (Jerry Sy)
writes:

>
>is there a list of jargon and their meanings used by hams on 2m/440,
>terms like
>
>destinated

This means "I'm tired of listening to you, windbag. I'm going somewhere
else." (On rare ocasions that somewhere else may be outside the car, but

not usually.)

>very good
>fine business

These are just null noises emitted instead of, or in addition to, "Uhhh" and "Ahhh" as space fillers for dead air. In some rare instances, they may actually mean "OK" or "I heard you", but the ham couldn't bring himself to use plain English. Their presence almost always means that no real conversation is occurring.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Wed, 2 Mar 94 09:14:13 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!uknet!uos-ee!
ee.surrey.ac.uk!M.Willis@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Low power Bird slugs
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <CLy9Jv.BI9@srngenprp.sr.hp.com>, alanb@sr.hp.com (Alan Bloom) writes:

|> Zack Lau (KH6CP) (zlau@arrl.org) wrote:
|> : groverc@gvgadg.gvg.tek.com wrote:
|>
|> : : Is there a Bird slug available that would do a credible job
|> : : of measuring <5w signals in the range 3-30MHz?
|>
|> : None that are compatible with the Bird 43. We asked Bird and
|> : were told that they couldn't even do a custom slug.
|>
|> I think I know why. A coupled-transmission-line directional coupler
|> has a sensitivity limited by the physical length. And the sensitivity
|> is inversely proportional to frequency -- That's why Bird slugs include
|> a shunt capacitor to flatten out the frequency response. At low (HF)
|> frequencies, I bet 50W is about the lowest sensitivity that is possible
|> with the available line length.
|>
|> AL N1AL

Not quite Al, you can get lower power HF slugs but they have severely restricted bandwidth, close coupling is required and the response suffers.

A good side of this is if you get a 1KW slug for VHF it often covers more than the frequency written on it. If you get a 1kW 200-500 MHz slug, it does a reasonable job on 144 MHz (you can always calibrate it against a known meter calibration on 144 MHz, and not too bad on 23 cms.

I have a 500W 50-125 MHz slug that is fine on 144 MHz. The error is less than I can measure against my genuine 250W 144 MHz slug.

I also use a 200-500 MHz 5W slug. It is fine on 432 MHz but also quite useful on 144 MHz. It is way out of calibration but it is still directional.

The onl HF slug I have is 500W 2-30 MHz. I think that is the lowest power available to cover the whole band

Mike
|>

Date: Wed, 2 Mar 1994 06:46:48 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!wa4mei.ping.com!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Medium range point-to-point digital links
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <CLyK5q.ILK@srngenprp.sr.hp.com> glenne@sad.hp.com (Glenn Elmore) writes:

>Zack Lau (KH6CP) (zlau@arrl.org) wrote:

>

>> Seems to me that Gary wants to set up a digital network
>> the hard way, with only people interested in digital
>> networks.

>

>Perhaps this is his way of keeping the user base small enough that the
>network he envisions can still provide at least mediocre service to each
>user. I don't see how that's going to happen with a national backbone of
>(only) 3000 56 kbps nodes otherwise.

If you can show how to setup and *maintain* 7x24 megabaud+ links to all areas of the US, I'm all for it. I don't see a chance in hell of that happening so I'm trying to bring this discussion around to things that are within the realm of the *possible*. 56 kb beyond LOS links look possible to me, many thousands of 10 GHz megabaud+ LOS sites do not. It's not microwave *technology* that's the problem, it's the *sites* and the people to maintain them that are the problem. Amateurs don't have enough of either to establish a *national* microwave network, and little or no hope of getting them. (Local or regional megabaud+ links

may be possible in certain areas, and I encourage that, but it just isn't going to happen nationwide unless we suddenly get 20 million new hams with optimum geographic dispersion.)

We're dealing with a very sparse matrix here. You don't seem to understand that as you sit in a dense metroplex with hams on nearly every block. The rest of the country just isn't like that. *Most* of our links are 60-80 miles long, over unfavorable terrain, to sites we can *get*. Nearly *none* of them are LOS. We *depend* on the beyond LOS propagation available most easily at lower frequencies to maintain those links. (If we could muster the power to do microwave forward scatter, that would be different, but there just aren't enough surplus TWTs out there to do the job, and site managers frown on 32 ft dishes on their towers. We *can't* depend on inversions and ducts, they just aren't reliable enough.)

Gary

```
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV          | You make it,      | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it.     | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way           | Guaranteed!      | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244    |                   |
```

Date: Wed, 2 Mar 1994 05:15:08 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!wa4mei.ping.com!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Mobile Phone
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Mar2.003533.10017@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu> wnelson@nyx10.cs.du.edu (W. Robert Nelson) writes:

>I am looking for a way to make phone calls from my car through my own phone
>line, not a cellular service. I have heard a little about 'autopatches', but
>have some questions.

>
>1 - I this possible with half duplex on one frequency? if so, would the
> person on the other end have to dial some touch-tone to switch the base
> unit from receive to transmit, etc?

Yes it's possible, and no the party on the phone isn't permitted to turn around the link (in the amateur service). A licensed individual has to do that, and it's normally done by the mobile operator dropping his carrier. IE you unkey the mic and the patch begins transmitting the phone line audio. When you key again, the patch starts feeding your audio to the phone line. Hence *half* duplex.

Note a repeater can do this easily because it's listening on a different frequency than that on which it's transmitting. For a *simpatch*, which

isn't a repeater, it's a bit more complex. The patch *samples* the frequency at short intervals (say 1/10th second every second) by dropping it's carrier and listening for yours. If it hears your carrier, it turns around, if not it goes back to transmitting phone audio. The short pops aren't too annoying.

>2 - Is there a charge for using ham repeaters.

Technically no. Amateurs aren't allowed to charge for the use of their stations. However, repeater owners have the right to limit access to their equipment, and one way they do that is to require operators to be members of their "club". There may be annual dues associated with the club.

>3 - Would my best bet be to try to get a ham liscence? My only reason would
> be for the phone service.

No. It's expressly forbidden for amateurs to use patches solely to avoid telco charges. If you want mobile phone, get a mobile phone. Patching is allowed in the amateur service only for experimental purposes, and for public service and emergency uses. They are not to be treated as alternatives to cellular, IMTS, or other common carrier systems. (Casual patches should be viewed as ways of *testing* the experimental or emergency system.) This is covered in Article 32 of the international regulations. (The FCC allows quite a bit more latitude for *domestic uses only* than what the international regulations require, but that doesn't mean there's a blank check to abuse the amateur system as a way of avoiding using the public telecommunications systems.)

>4 - Could it be done with a CB? Would it be legal? What is the range?

I've heard simpatches being used on CB (Hell, I've heard all sorts of things on CB). I'm not sure whether such an interconnect is legal in the CB service. Part 95 doesn't say, but it may fall under the same common carrier restrictions as other telco bypass schemes. Simpatches are legal in certain *commercially* licensed services. That would be your best course if you *must* interconnect to the telco system via your home line. Otherwise, an IMTS or cellular phone is your best alternative.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Tue, 1 Mar 94 16:57:10 GMT
From: dtint!allenw1.dtint.com!allen@uunet.uu.net
Subject: QST review of Dual-Bander HTs
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In the last QST, they reviewed 4 different dual-band HTs. The question I have, is what is their extended TX / RX frequency range when modified?

For example, I've heard a rumor that the TH-78A can transmit AM down in the aircraft band. I don't believe it, nor would I ever want to transmit down there!

I've also heard that most receive well into the 800 MHZ range.

Can anyone enlighten me?

73,

Allen Wallace

--

Tom Kimpton(System Administrator)	{root,tom}@dtint.dtint.com
Digital Technology Int.	(801)226-2984
500 W. 1200 South, Orem UT, 84057	FAX (801) 226-8438

Date: Tue, 1 Mar 1994 20:37:07 +0000
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!uknet!demon!
isis.demon.co.uk!ian@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Satellite progs on World
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <wylzCLLyFJ.IpF@netcom.com> wylz@netcom.com "Scott Ehrlich" writes:

>
>I have now placed some satellite tracking programs on World:
>
>- stsplus.zip
>
>- stsortbit.zip
>
>- traksat {trak300a.zip & trak300b.zip} (latest version of traksat)
>
>
>They are available via anonymous FTP via
>

>ftp ftp.std.com:/pub/hamradio/pc/satellite
>
>
>If you have any problems, questions, or comments, please e-mail them to me.
>
>I tried very hard to search for stsplus through many archie searches, and
>only found one site which carried it. I hope that by making it available
>on World it will be easier to obtain.

Ah, but which version of STSPLUS is it ? The damned thing gets updated two or three times a year, or so it seems. The version numbering is pretty unusual as well. For what it's worth, the latest I've seen is 9353, which if I recall the method makes it the last week in '93. 9333 was the last *major* upgrade.

Regards

Ian.

--

Ian Smith	"The Moving Finger writes;
ian@isis.demon.co.uk	and, having writ, Moves on."

Date: 3 Mar 94 03:53:18 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: SUBSCRIBE
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

SUBSCRIBE

Date: Wed, 2 Mar 1994 05:42:02 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!wa4mei.ping.com!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1994Feb27.205435.7993@arrl.org>,
<1994Feb28.154040.17074@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <1994Feb28.212904.10734@arrl.org>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Medium range point-to-point digital links

In article <1994Feb28.212904.10734@arrl.org> zlau@arrl.org (Zack Lau (KH6CP)) writes:

>Seems to me that Gary wants to set up a digital network
>the hard way, with only people interested in digital
>networks.

Actually I'm trying to say we need to set up the network the *right* way with people who will *keep* the network operational as a service provider. That's a different mentality than that normally found among DXers and contesters. (Not that there aren't some from those groups who *also* have the service mentality, just that it isn't a normal part of DXing or contesting.)

>In the Northeast, winning the 10 GHz contest depends
>on *reliable* links. After all, there is the certainty
>of rain and the even the possibility of snow... Dale
>made his long haul contact and I didn't--with no
>effect on the who won. Even my longest contact
>was made over a path known to work well. This is
>why I haul stuff up hiking trails, rather than
>hoping for an opening....

In reading the articles on 10 GHz operating in the current QST, one wouldn't get the impression of *reliable* links with 50 db fade margins that work reliably 7x24 year after year. *That's* the kind of links a digital network must have.

>I wasn't saying that you should have contesters
>set up your links, much less maintain them. But,
>why not get some hands on experience if its
>available? People pay big \$\$ to get hands on
>training with the guidance of experts. I know
>in the Northeast there are groups willing to
>help out beginners, especially if they are willing
>to spend a weekend or two helping to make contacts.

I don't oppose people tapping into the contesting domain for some experience and training on 10 GHz equipment. But I must caution them that the sort of training that they'll get isn't directly transferable to setting up and maintaining *reliable* data trunks. I got my own training and experience in the commercial world setting up and maintaining intercity relay sites. That's the sort of carefully engineered systems we have to have for a national data network.

>Often, contesters just happen to have access to
>the equipment you say is unavailable.

Looking at the cumulative results table in QST, I'd say that such equipment is spread mighty thin for a national network.

>From what I've seen, HF contesters *do* have
>a suitable mindset for setting up a network.
>Perhaps not your idea of what a digital network
>is suppose to be, but much of the Northeast
>is linked by the Frankford Radio Club and the
>Yankee Clipper Contest club (they are actually
>competitors trying to wind DX contests).
>They even have a source of funding--sales of CT
>(one of the contest logging programs)
>support the network. True, the network doesn't
>support much more than DX spots and shortages
>on a contest weekend, but if it suits the
>needs of the people that spend their time building
>and maintaining it....

Ah yes, DX Packetcluster. "Hey George, the link's flaky."
"Well put up stacked beams and pile on the kilowatts,
to hell with the other digital users, the DX spots
have to get through." (I've actually heard exchanges
like that. The lack of cooperation between the Packetcluster
operators and the rest of the digital community is somewhat
legendary. It's that Type A DXer mentality.)

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #228

